

## REMARKS

### Office Action

In the Office Action mailed on November 23, 2007, the Examiner rejected claims 1-15 and 20 as being unpatentable over U.S. Publication Number 2001/0038462 to Teeuwen et al. (hereinafter "Teeuwen") in view of U.S. Patent Number 6,552,813 to Yacoub (hereinafter "Yacoub"). For reasons set forth in more detail below, Applicants respectfully submit that the combination cited by the Examiner does not disclose all of the limitations of the independent claims 1, 5, and 11 and therefore, all of the pending claims are patentable over all references of record, either alone or in combination.

### The Section 103 Ground of Rejection

In the presentation of the section 103 ground of rejection, the Examiner asserts that the Teeuwen reference discloses a printer control panel having a control panel display that displays information about currently pending print jobs that have been sent to a network printer associated with the control panel with an indication of an ability of the network printer to execute pending print jobs displayed on the control panel display. Applicants respectfully submit that the Teeuwen reference does not disclose this limitation. In the presentation of the argument by the Examiner citation is made to paragraphs 14 and 15 of the Teeuwen reference. Those paragraphs of Teeuwen indicate a list of files is displayed on the operator control unit of a printer, but these paragraphs do not disclose any display of the network printer ability. The absence of *any* display of network printer ability, especially any network printer ability for a pending print job presented on the display, is fatal to the section 103 ground of rejection as that limitation is found in none of the references of record.

In the Examiner's presentation of the section 103 ground of rejection, the Examiner admits that Teeuwen does not disclose an input mechanism associated with the network printer, the input mechanism being adapted to allow a network user to select another network printer. To remedy that deficiency, the Examiner relies upon Yacoub for the disclosure of that limitation and cites column 9, lines 31-53 of that reference for that

purpose. That section of Yacoub, however, refers to use of a GUI at a client station, which is not an input mechanism associated with a network printer. Therefore, the Yacoub reference does not teach or suggest the limitation of the input mechanism associated with a network printer in claims 1 and 5 or the receipt of data at a network printer as required by claim 11. Therefore, the Yacoub reference does not support the Examiner's asserted section 103 ground of rejection with regard to all of the pending independent claims.

All of the remaining pending claims, 2-4, 6-10, 12-15 and 20, depend directly or indirectly from these claims. Therefore, the Examiner has failed to present a section 103 ground of rejection that is properly supported by the cited references and the section 103 ground of rejection should be withdrawn.

### **Conclusion**

For the reasons set forth above, pending claims 1-15 and 20 are patentable over all references of record, either alone or in combination. As this response is being filed within the two months of the mailing of the office action, an advisory action allowing all of the pending claims is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,  
MAGINOT, MOORE & BECK LLP

/David M. Lockman/  
David M. Lockman  
Attorney for Applicant  
Registration No. 34,214

January 23, 2008  
Maginot, Moore & Beck LLP  
Chase Tower  
111 Monument Circle, Suite 3250  
Indianapolis, Indiana 46204-5109  
(317) 638-2922 Telephone  
(317) 638-2139 Facsimile